

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| TERRANCE WALKER, |) | 3:15-CV-0556-RCJ (VPC) |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | <u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u> |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | May 16, 2016 |
| |) | |
| CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, |) | |
| INC., et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is plaintiff's motion to deem responses to plaintiff's first set of request for admissions admitted and motion for other sanctions (#62). Defendants filed an opposition #73/74) and plaintiff replied (#75).

Plaintiff's motion (#62) is **DENIED** for failure to meet and confer and for failure to provide certification that he has been unable to resolve the matter without court action pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 37 and LR 26-7(b). The court also finds plaintiff's motion procedurally defective under Local Rule 26-7(a). In addition, plaintiff's requests for admissions are compound requests that were served jointly on two separate defendant entities rendering them difficult and ambiguous at best, if not entirely impossible to answer. Finally, deeming plaintiff's requests admitted is not a proper remedy pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 36(a)(6).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk